

ENTERED

June 30, 2022

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------|
| ANDRE BERNARD | § | CIVIL ACTION No. |
| WILLIAMS, | § | 4:20-cv-03358 |
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| vs. | § | JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| KILOLO KIJAKAZI, | § | |
| Defendant. | § | |

**ORDER ADOPTING
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Christina A. Bryan dated May 31, 2022. Dkt 26. No party filed objections.

The district court reviews *de novo* those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party has specifically objected. See FRCP 72(b)(3) & 28 USC § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989, *per curiam*). The district court may accept any other portions to which there's no objection if satisfied that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, *en banc*); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

No clear error appears upon review and consideration of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law.

The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 26.

The motion by the Commissioner for summary judgment is GRANTED. Dkt 17.

The motion and amended motion by Plaintiff Andrew Williams for summary judgment are DENIED. Dkts 21 & 22.

The final decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

A final judgment will issue separately.

SO ORDERED.

Signed on June 30, 2022, at Houston, Texas.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ch R Eskridge" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Hon. Charles Eskridge
United States District Judge